

United States Patent and Trademark Office

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONTRACTOR
10/088,995	03/26/2002	Norio Kashiwa	ZU-411	CONFIRMATION NO
• •	590 10/15/2004	EXAMINER		
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P POST OFFICE BOX 1404			LU, C CAIXIA	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1713	

DATE MAILED: 10/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/088,995	KASHIWA ET AL.			
, and and an	Examiner	Art Unit			
·	Caixia Lu	1713			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 28 September 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the context o	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THOUSE OF THE CONTRACT OF THE CONTR	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action: or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	Brief must be filed within the pe	riod set forth in the appeal.			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	cause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require furthe	r consideration and/or search (s	ee NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cancelingNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would I canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	pe allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NOT place the			
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	use it is not directed SOLELY to	s issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	s) a)⊡ will not be entered or b)[uld be rejected is provided belov	will be entered and an or appended.			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: 8.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>11-15</u> .					
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appro	oved or b) disapproved by th	e Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·			
0. Other:		Part of			
		Caixia Lu, Ph. D. Primary Examiner			
Palent and Trademark Office		Art Unit: 1713			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the same rationale as set forth in the previous Office action mailed on May 4, 2004. Applicant's Declaration filed on September 28, 2004 fails to shown criticality and unexpected results over Markel because applicant's Declaration does not provide any evidence to show the critical difference between applicant's branched polyolefin and those of the cited prior art.